

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/942,317	08/29/2001	Thuan Pham	8016-548	7738
7	7590 11/04/2005		EXAM	INER
Brad A. Schepers, Esq.			EL ARINI, ZEINAB	
Woodard, Emhardt, Naughton, Moriarty and McNett Bank One Center/Tower			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700			1746	
Indianapolis, IN 46204-5137			DATE MAILED: 11/04/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			D
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/942,317	PHAM, THUAN	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Zeinab E. EL-Arini	1746	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stany reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT atute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed "HS from the mailing date of this communication ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	4 August 2005.		
	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	wance except for formal matte	ers, prosecution as to the merits i	s
closed in accordance with the practice under	er <i>Ex parte Quayl</i> e, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			•
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-8,10-17,19,20 and 22-30</u> is/are p 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are witho 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-8, 10-17, 19-20, 22-30</u> is/are rejection is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	drawn from consideration.		
Application Papers	·		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	sinor.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a		v the Examiner	
Applicant may not request that any objection to			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	rection is required if the drawing(s	s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		-	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in Appriority documents have been received in Appriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	🗖		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		/Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/942,317

Art Unit: 1746

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment and remarks filed 08/24/05 have been acknowledged and entered.

Claims 2-8, 10-17, 19-20, and 22-30 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, stated in paper No. 032405 has been withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment and remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 19, 2-8, 11-17, 20 and 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biancalana et al. (4,552,163).

Biancalana et al. disclose a device for cleaning, disinfecting and drying instruments. The device comprises a housing, at least one nozzle, a sensor adapted to detect a presence of the object to be cleaned, and a valve as claimed. The reference also discloses that when the instrument is introduced into the chamber under the control of the photoelectric cells, the operative cycle starts and the valves 33, 34, open, thus providing pressurized air and water to the nozzles 10, so that pressurized air reaches said nozzles. At the same time valve 35 opens, therefore the atomizer 12 starts to work and a flow of air containing disinfectant reaches the nozzles 11. After the predetermined

Application/Control Number: 09/942,317

Art Unit: 1746

washing time, the electro-valves 33 and 34 close. The reference also discloses waterair mixing unit. See col. 4, lines 54-64, col. 3, lines 51-56, and claims 1 and 6.

Biancalana et al. as discussed supra disclose all limitation with the exception of the alcohols as claimed.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the alcohol as disinfectant agent which is inherently cleaning agent in the Biancalana et al. to obtain the claimed apparatus, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.,

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use the alcohols as disinfectant agent in the Biancalana et al. cleaning apparatus to enhance the cleaning and to obtain the claimed apparatus. This is because it is well known in the art that the alcohols can be used as cleaning and disinfecting solution. Therefore one skilled in the art would use the alcohols instead of the disinfectant taught by Biancalana et al. to obtain the claimed apparatus. The disinfectant solution is inherently used as cleaning solution.

Re claim 17, the limitation of claim 17, is for intended use limitation.

2. Claims 10 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biancalana et al. as applied to claims 19, 2-8, 11-17, 20, and 22-29 above, and further in view of Gaydoul et al. (6,029,681).

Application/Control Number: 09/942,317

Art Unit: 1746

Biancalana et al. as discussed supra do not teach means for adjusting a distance as claimed.

Gaydoul et al. disclose the means for adjusting the distance as claimed. See the abstract.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use the distance adjusting means taught by Gaydoul et al. in the Biancalana et al. apparatus to improve the efficiency of the cleaning apparatus.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-8, 10-17, 19, 20, and 22-30 is unpersuasive, because claims directed to apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. In re Danly, 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). "[A]pparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does". Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc., 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ 2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 1.746

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zeinab E. EL-Arini whose telephone number is (571) 272-1301. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on (571) 272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Zeinab E. EL-Arini Primary Examiner Art Unit 1746

ZEE 11/01/05